REMARKS

Independent claims 1-5, 7, 8, 11, 13-15, 21, 22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, and 45-47 are currently pending in the application. No claims have been added, amended, or canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, 21-22, 24-26, 32, 34, 41, and 45-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 to Beatty et al. ("Beatty") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962 to Weinberg et al. ("Weinberg"). Beatty discloses a system and method for debugging software to control a digital signal processor (DSP) and a general purpose computer employing either the system or the method. Beatty further discloses controlling a real DSP or an emulated DSP. Beatty discloses an architecture database, storable on a storage device of the general purpose computer that contains a plurality of user-selectable architectures corresponding to a plurality of DSPs, the system thereby allowing the user to select a particular DSP from the database. Beatty allows the user to develop DSP software for a DSP that has not yet been produced.

Weinberg discloses a visual web site analysis program. The program is implemented as a collection of software components for providing a variety of features for facilitating an analysis and management of web sites and website content. A mapping component scans a web site over a network connection and builds a site map which graphically depicts URLs and links of the site.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for providing a visualization of an underlying architecture of a software system within a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Beatty and Weinberg fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one distinguishing feature of claim 1, namely, performing a graphical operation on the web page for dynamic visualization of the graphical elements indicative of the underlying architecture of the software system.

The Office Action asserts that the feature of performing a graphical operation on the web page for dynamic visualization of the graphical elements indicative of the underlying architecture of the software system is taught by Beatty. Applicant respectfully submits that the visualization disclosed in Beatty is a *static* visualization of the graphical elements, whereas the invention defined in claim 1 is directed to a *dynamic* visualization of the graphical elements. Referring to col. 6 lines 22-26 of Beatty, Beatty discloses displaying an architecture of a

2

particular DSP, including a graphical device layout and at least one field corresponding to a register of the DSP. The Examiner asserts that the graphical representation in the graphical device layout of Beatty corresponds to the *graphical elements* indicative of the underlying architecture of the software system referred to in claim 1. Referring to the antecedent basis of *graphical elements* in claim 1, the graphical elements are said to be representative of the architectural components. The *graphical elements* in Beatty, therefore must be the diagrammatic elements forming the graphical representation of the DSP architecture. The graphical representation within the graphical device layout of Beatty, however, is not a *dynamic* visualization of the *graphical elements* representative of the architectural components.

The graphical representation in the graphical device layout of Beatty is displayed based on an architecture selected from a database (Beatty, col. 6 lines 22-26). As the DSP changes states, Beatty discloses updating the at least one field, a *numerical representation* in a table, but does not disclose updating the *graphical elements* in the graphical device layout (Beatty, col. 6 lines 31, 39-43). As a result, the *graphical elements* representative of the architecture are not disclosed to be changed and remain *static*, providing a *static* representation of the DSP architecture. The static nature of the graphical elements in Beatty is illustrated in Figures 4-11. These figures illustrate the displays resulting from certain DSP state changes. Applicant respectfully submits that *numerical representations* change with the states, but the *graphical elements* remain *static*, appearing identically from one state to the next.

In contrast, in the invention of claim 1, there is a *dynamic* visualization of the *graphical elements* indicative of the underlying architecture of the software system. In various embodiments, of the claimed invention, the dynamic visualization may be to highlight the graphical elements in correspondence with the execution of a software system, providing a *dynamic* visualization of the *graphical elements*. Applicant respectfully submits that, independent claim 1 distinguishes over Beatty. Weinberg fails to cure the above-described deficiency of Beatty. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 32 is directed to a computer-readable medium having stored thereon sequences of instructions. Applicant respectfully submits that, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 32 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 32 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 41 is directed to an application service provider (ASP) system for visualizing an architecture of another distinct system. Applicant respectfully submits that, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 41 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 32 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 depend from and further restrict claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 distinguish over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 2-5, 7-8, 11, 13-15, and 45-47 be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 34 depends from and further restricts independent claim 33 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 33, dependent claim 34 distinguishes over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claim 34 be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 21-26 depend from and further restrict claim 41 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1, dependent claims 21-26 distinguish over the combination of Beatty and Weinberg. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 21-26 be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. A Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 4, 2006   Respectfully submitted,

                                              Electronic signature: /Ross T. Robinson/
                                              Ross T. Robinson
                                                 Registration No.: 47,031
                                              JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
                                                 CORPORATION
                                              1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700
                                              Dallas, Texas 75202
                                              (214) 855-4500
                                              Attorneys For Applicant